REMARKS

1.   Applicant thanks the Office for its remarks and observations, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

2.   **35 U.S.C. § 102**
""A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1989)." "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimus verbis* test, *i.e.* identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990.)" MPEP § 2131.

Claims 1-18 are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,898,624 ("Young").

The Office relies on Young, col. 3, lines 21-25 and 35-42 as teaching "assigning a telephone number to a printer . . . ." Applicant respectfully disagrees.   At col. 3, lines 22-24, Young describes, "[T]he predetermined phone number used to transmit the fax to a service provider 110 is <u>assigned by the service provider to an entity when the entity subscribes to a "fax receive via EWS" service</u>" (emphasis added).

Additionally, at col. 3, lines 31-34, Young describes, "<u>A unique Universal Resource Locator (URL) is assigned by a network administrator to the entity's EWS network printer 116</u>" (emphasis added).

Thus, what is described in Young, is that <u>a telephone number is associated to the subscriber</u> and <u>a URL is associated to the subscriber's printer</u>. There is, therefore, no teaching in Young of <u>assigning a telephone number to a printer</u>.

The Office relies on Young, col. 3, lines 45-55 as teaching "associating a print job with said telephone number . . . ." Applicant respectfully disagrees. At col. 4, lines 13-17, Young describes, "[T]he service provider 110 communicates the Web page containing the converted fax data over the Internet 112 to the address of the identified URL" (emphasis added). In this manner the converted fax is transmitted to the appropriate EWS 116 in the corresponding EWS enabled printer." Accordingly, Young teaches that the fax is associated not to a telephone number but to a URL.

The Office relies on Young, col. 3, lines 5-10 and Fig. 1 as teaching "forwarding said print job from a print job source to a spooling server over a network." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Young describes at col. 3, lines 6-8, "The fax is transmitted from a fax machine (not shown) through the telephone network 106 to the service provider 110" (emphasis added). There is thus no mention of a spooling server in the cited teaching from Young. Fig. 1 adds nothing, merely showing a block labeled "service provider." Accordingly, there is no teaching in Young of forwarding said print job from a print job source to a spooling server over a network.

Because Young fails to teach each and every element of Claim 1, the present rejection is improper. Claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable over Young. In view of their dependence from Claim 1, Claim 1's dependent Claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

The foregoing remarks apply equally to Claim 10. Claim 10 and its dependent Claims are therefore deemed allowable over Young.

Applicant nevertheless has the following comments regarding the dependent Claims:

Claims 6 and 15: The Office relies on Young's EWS 116 as teaching "forwarding the facsimile to the spooling server from the facsimile server." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As Applicant has previously stated above, there is no teaching anywhere in Young of a spooling server. As described at col. 4, lines 4-24, fax data is first wrapped in a web page; the web page containing the fax data is sent to the URL assigned to the EWS (encapsulated web server) on

the entity's printer; the EWS extracts the fax data from the web page and communicates the extracted fax data to the printer, which, in turn, prints out the converted fax. Accordingly, <u>there is no teaching in Young of spooling print jobs or of a spooling server</u>. Because Young fails to teach each and every element of Claims 6 and 15, the present rejection is improper. Because the present rejection of Claims 6 and 15 is improper, even if Claims 1 and 10 were not allowable, Claims 6 and 15 would be allowable over Young.

Claims 9 and 18: The Office relies on Young's mapping table, 118, shown in Fig. 1 as teaching "wherein <u>said telephone number is dynamically assigned to the printer</u> at <u>a user interface associated with said printer</u> . . . ." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As Applicant has discussed above, there is no description anywhere in Young that a telephone number is assigned to a printer. As discussed above, a telephone number is assigned to the <u>subscriber</u>. <u>A URL is assigned to the EWS on the printer</u>. Young's mapping table serves only to associate the subscriber phone number and the URL of the EWS. There is <u>no teaching</u> in Young <u>that a telephone number is assigned to a printer</u>. Even if Young did teach that a telephone number were assigned to the printer, there is no teaching that the telephone number is <u>dynamically assigned</u>. As described in col. 3, lines 11 to 30, the telephone number is assigned to the subscriber, a URL is assigned to the printer and the telephone number and the URL are associated in the mapping table. There is nothing dynamic about the process at all. Thus, there is no teaching in Young that a telephone number is <u>dynamically assigned to a printer</u>.

Even if Young did teach <u>that a telephone number is dynamically assigned to a printer</u>, there is no teaching in Young that a telephone number is dynamically assigned to the printer <u>at a user interface associated with the printer</u>. There is no mention whatsoever of <u>a user interface associated with a printer</u>. Additionally, there is no teaching of using a user interface to dynamically assign a telephone number to the printer.

There is, therefore, no teaching in Young that a telephone number is dynamically assigned to the printer <u>at a user interface associated with the printer</u>.

Because Young fails to teach each and every element of Claims 9 and 18, the present rejection is improper. Because the present rejection of Claims 9 and 18 is improper, even if Claims 1 and 10 were not allowable, Claims 9 and 18 would be allowable over Young.

3. For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Application is deemed in allowable condition. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the Application, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862